

REMARKS

Claims 1-33 and 35 will be pending upon entry of the present Amendment.
Claims 31-33 and 35 are amended, and claim 34 is cancelled.

Applicant thanks Examiner Kershteyn for his consideration during the telephone interview with the undersigned representative on July 19, 2006. The subject of discussion was the scope and language of claim 11 and its dependent claims.

With regard to the rejection of claims 12-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, the representative explained that it was the applicant's intent that claim 11 recite only the yoke and trunnion, without reciting a pump casing or bearing, but that the yoke and trunnion were recited as they related to a casing and bearing of a pump, hence the language *configured to*. For example, claim 11 recites "a trunnion coupled to the yoke and *configured to* be received by an aperture of a pump casing." Thus, the claim is limited to a trunnion such as would be received in a pump casing, but the casing, *per se*, is not an element of the claim. Accordingly, where claim 12 recites *a casing*, this is the first introduction of a casing as a new element, and is appropriately preceded by the indefinite article *a*.

The trunnion of claim 11 is further limited as being *configured to* receive a bearing, but again, the recital of a bearing is by way of characterization of the structure of the trunnion, rather than as a separate element. Accordingly, claim 13, which recites *a bearing* as a new element, is not indefinite.

Applicant understands that the Examiner recognizes the distinction between the description of a separate feature as a structural limitation of a recited feature, and the explicit recital of the separate feature in a dependent claim.

With regard to the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the representative noted that each of the prior art references relied upon to reject claim 11 teaches a pin on which its yoke rotates, while claim 11 recites a trunnion coupled to the yoke. Thus, the bearing disclosed in the Molly reference is positioned between the pin and the yoke, rather than between the trunnion and the wall of the aperture (of the casing), as recited in claim 11.

Applicant understands that Examiner Kershteyn acknowledged that this distinction was sufficient to distinguish claim 11 over the art currently of record.

Claims 31-33 and 35 have been amended in order to distinguish these claims on the same basis. The amendment has rendered claim 34 redundant, which is therefore cancelled.

Finally, applicant understands the Examiner to have indicated that claim 15 was allowable on its own merit, inasmuch as the art of record does not teach or suggest a bearing having "a shape of a section of a cone" as recited in the claim.


The forgoing represents the applicant's understanding of the substance of the interview. If the applicant is mistaken in any respect with regard to this understanding, the Examiner is respectfully requested to clarify his position.

All of the claims remaining in the application are now believed to be allowable. Favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. In the event the Examiner finds minor informalities that can be resolved by telephone conference, the Examiner is urged to contact applicant's undersigned representative at (206) 694-4848 in order to expeditiously resolve prosecution of this application.

The Director is authorized to charge any additional fees due by way of this Amendment, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-1090.

Respectfully submitted,

SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC


Harold H. Bennett II
Registration No. 52,404

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 6300
Seattle, Washington 98104-7092
Phone: (206) 622-4900
Fax: (206) 682-6031